

line 50, consisting of two portions connecting at interconnecting plug 60, bypassing portions 54 and 56 of a single wordline.”

Applicant respectfully traverses the responses to Applicant’s arguments, and presents the following evidence in support of the traversal. Applicant notes that Figure 16 in particular, is confusing in that it does not show details that are shown in Figure 17 and are discussed in the specification. Figures 16-18 of Tanoi illustrate a “fourth embodiment” that is described in the specification in column 9, line 29 to column 10, line 7. Wordlines shown in Figure 16 are described in the specification in column 9 lines 30-31 as divided into **“two physically and electrically distinct segments”** referring to segments 110 and 114. The segments appear attached in Figure 16, however closer examination of Figure 17 and text such as the excerpt above show that the segments 110 and 114 are in fact separate.

Figure 17 shows a detailed view of the physically and electrically distinct segments 110 and 114 as shown in Figure 16. In column 9, lines 46-48, the wordline is further described. “Except for the **separation of the high resistance word lines into segments**, the layout is the same as in the third embodiment.” The increased detail of Figure 17 over Figure 16 shows a gap between segment 110 and segment 114 making the segments physically and electrically distinct as stated in the specification of Tanoi. Applicant respectfully submits that the physically and electrically distinct segments 110 and 114 do not form a single wordline.

Regarding Figure 4, applicant again respectfully traverses the responses to Applicant’s previous arguments. Figure 4 appears to show two electrically and physically isolated segments 54 and 56. Applicant respectfully submits that a number of separated segments are not equivalent to a single wordline as indicated in the present claims.

In contrast, Applicant’s independent claims each include at least two channels connecting the strapping line to a first and second end of a portion of a single wordline. Because the Tanoi reference does not show every element of Applicant’s independent claims, a 35 USC § 102(b) rejection is not supported. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to Applicant’s independent claims 1, 5, 8, 15, 19, 26, 30, 37, 42, 45, 1nd 49. Additionally, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested with respect to the remaining claims that depend therefrom as depending on allowable base claims.

AMENDMENT & RESPONSE UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 - EXPEDITED PROCEDURE

Serial Number: 09/808,750

Filing Date: March 15, 2001

Title: DEVICE AND METHOD TO REDUCE WORDLINE RC TIME CONSTANT IN SEMICONDUCTOR MEMORY DEVICES

Page 3

Dkt: 303.723US1

CONCLUSION

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (612) 373-6944 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

HUY THANH VO

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6944

Date

12-18-02

By


David C. Peterson
Reg. No. 47,857

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Box AF, Commissioner of Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on this 18th day of December, 2002.

Name

Amy Moriarty

Signature

